

2005 DRAFT ANNUAL OPERATING PLAN
FOR
COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM RESERVOIRS

Note: Data for year 2004 in this draft Annual Operating Plan is based largely upon projections from May 2004 twenty four month study. This data is displayed in blue font, and will be updated at the end of the water year to reflect observed conditions.

INTRODUCTION

Authority

This 2005 annual operating plan (AOP) was developed in accordance with Section 602 of *The Colorado River Basin Project Act* (Public Law 90-537), and the *Criteria for Coordinated Long-Range Operation of Colorado River Reservoirs Pursuant to the Colorado River Basin Project Act of September 30, 1968* (Operating Criteria), promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) pursuant thereto. In accordance with *The Colorado River Basin Project Act* and the Operating Criteria, the AOP must be developed and administered consistent with applicable Federal laws, *The Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande, Treaty Between the United States of America and Mexico*, signed February 3, 1944 (1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty), interstate compacts, court decrees, Colorado River Interim Surplus Guidelines, Final Environmental Impact Statement (Interim Surplus Guidelines) (66 Federal Register 7772), **Interim 602(a) Storage Guideline, Final Environmental Assessment (Interim 602(a) Storage Guideline) (68 Federal Register 28945)**, and other documents relating to the use of the waters of the Colorado River, which are commonly and collectively known as “The Law of the River.”

The Operating Criteria and Section 602 of *The Colorado River Basin Project Act* mandate consultation with representatives of the Governors of the seven Basin States and such other parties as the Secretary may deem appropriate in preparing the annual plan for operation of the Colorado River reservoirs. In addition, *The Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992* (Title XVIII of Public Law 102-575) requires consultation to include the general public and others. Accordingly, the 2005 AOP was prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) in consultation with the seven Basin States Governors’ representatives; the Upper Colorado River Commission; Native American Tribes; appropriate Federal agencies; representatives of the academic and scientific communities, environmental organizations, and the recreation industry; water delivery contractors; contractors for the purchase of Federal power; others interested in Colorado River operations; and the general public, through the Colorado River Management Work Group (CRMWG).

Purpose

The purposes of the AOP are to determine: (1) the projected operation of the Colorado River reservoirs to satisfy project purposes under varying hydrologic and climatic conditions; (2) the quantity of water considered necessary as of September 30, 2005, to be in storage in the Upper Basin reservoirs as required by Section 602(a) of *The Colorado River Basin Project Act*; (3) water available for delivery pursuant to the 1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty and Minute No. 242 of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico (IBWC); (4) whether the reasonable consumptive use requirements of mainstream users in the Lower Division States will be met under a “Normal,” “Surplus,” or “Shortage” condition as outlined in Article III of the Operating Criteria; and (5) whether water apportioned to, but unused by one or more Lower Division States exists and can be used to satisfy beneficial consumptive use requests of mainstream users in other Lower Division States as provided in the 1964 U.S. Supreme Court Decree in *Arizona v. California* (Decree), and the Interim Surplus Guidelines.

Consistent with the above determinations and in accordance with other applicable provisions of the “Law of the River,” the AOP was developed with “appropriate consideration of the uses of the reservoirs for all purposes, including flood control, river regulation, beneficial consumptive uses, power production, water quality control, recreation, enhancement of fish and wildlife, and other environmental factors” (Operating Criteria, Article I (2)).

Since the hydrologic conditions of the Colorado River Basin can never be completely known in advance, the AOP addresses the operations resulting from three different hydrologic scenarios: the probable maximum, most probable, and probable minimum reservoir inflow conditions. River operations under the plan are modified during the year as runoff predictions are adjusted to reflect existing snowpack, basin storage, and flow conditions.

Summary

Upper Basin Delivery. The minimum objective release criterion will control the annual release from Glen Canyon Dam during water year 2005 in accordance with Article II(2) of the Operating Criteria unless spill avoidance and/or the storage equalization criteria in Article II(3) is controlling. **Consistent with Section V of the Interim 602(a) Storage Guideline, releases from Lake Powell greater than the minimum objective of 8.23 maf (10,150 mcm), to maintain, as nearly as practicable, active storage in Lake Mead equal to the active storage in Lake Powell, will be made if storage in Lake Powell, on September 30, 2005, is projected to be greater than 14.85 maf (water surface elevation 3,630 feet), and active storage in Lake Powell is greater than active storage in Lake Mead.**

Lower Basin Delivery. Under the most probable inflow scenario, downstream deliveries are expected to control the releases from Hoover Dam.

~~The suspension of surplus determinations under Section 2(B)(1) and 2(B)(2) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines remained in effect until October 10, 2003, at which time California completed all required actions pursuant to Section 5(B) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines. Consistent with Section 5(B) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, the interim surplus determinations under Sections 2(B)(1) and 2(B)(2) were reinstated on October 10, 2003. The October 10, 2003, Colorado River Water Delivery Agreement provides for California to make the reductions in water use reflected in Section 5(C) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines.~~

Taking into account (1) the existing water storage conditions in the basin, (2) the most probable near-term water supply conditions in the basin, and (3) **Sections 2(B)(1) and 7** of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, the _____ condition is the criterion governing the operation of Lake Mead for calendar year 2005 in accordance with **Article III(3)(b)** of the Operating Criteria and **Article II(B)(2)** of the Decree, subject to **Section 5(C)** of the Interim Surplus Guidelines.

Reclamation does not anticipate any available unused apportionment for calendar year 2005 at this time. ~~However, if any unused apportionment is available, the Secretary shall allocate any available unused apportionments for calendar year 2005 in accordance with Article II(B)(6) of the Decree and Section 1(B) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines.~~

In accordance with 43 CFR Part 414 (Offstream Storage of Colorado River Water; Development and Release of Intentionally Created Unused Apportionment in the Lower Division States: Final Rule), Intentionally Created Unused Apportionment (ICUA) may be made available by a Lower Division state for use in another Lower Division state via a Storage and Interstate Release Agreement (SIRA) with the Secretary. On December 18, 2002, the United States, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, executed a SIRA with the Arizona Water Banking Authority, the Southern Nevada Water Authority, and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada. Assuming all requirements are met, the Secretary will make up to 20,000 acre-feet of ICUA available to the consuming entity (Southern Nevada Water Authority) from the storing entity (Arizona Water Banking Authority) in 2005.

1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty Delivery. A volume of 1.5 million acre-feet (maf), 1,850 million cubic meters (mcm) of water will be available to be scheduled for delivery to Mexico during calendar year 2005 in accordance with Article 15 of the 1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty and Minutes No. 242 and 310 of the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC).

~~The International Boundary and Water Commission concluded Minute No. 310 entitled “Emergency Delivery of Colorado River Water for Use in Tijuana, Baja California,” on July 28, 2003. The Minute allows for the delivery of approximately 1,200 acre feet per month of Colorado River water through the California agencies’ distribution system facilities to Tijuana, Baja California. In conformance with the provisions of the Minute, the volume of water delivered and the system conveyance losses will be charged against the total volume of Colorado River water apportioned under the 1944 U.S. Mexico Water Treaty. The Tijuana utility, the State Commission for Public Services of Tijuana (CESPT), pays all financial costs incurred in making such deliveries. This arrangement will be implemented via an agreement among the Otay Water District, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the San Diego County Water Authority, the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and Reclamation and will be applicable through calendar year 2008.~~

2004 OPERATIONS SUMMARY AND RESERVOIR STATUS

Once again, drier than average hydrologic conditions were observed in the Colorado River basin in 2004, marking the fifth consecutive year of drought in the basin. Basinwide precipitation was 83 percent of average during water year 2004 with snowpack accumulations also being below normal levels. Total unregulated⁽¹⁾ inflow into Lake Powell for water year 2004 was 6.36 maf (7,845 mcm) or 53 percent of average.

Hydrologic conditions in the Colorado River Basin appeared to be more favorable in the winter of 2004, than in the previous four years. During the winter period, basinwide snowpack was near average and at times above average. On March 1, 2004, basinwide snowpack in the Upper Colorado River Basin was 97 percent of average, with the forecasted April through July inflow to Lake Powell at 82 percent of average. However, March 2004 was an exceptionally warm and dry month throughout the basin. A significant deterioration of the snowpack occurred during the month. By April 1, 2004, basinwide snowpack had decreased to 66 percent of average, a reduction of 31 percentage points in only one month. Inflow projections to Lake Powell were reduced to 50 percent of average at this time. Further reductions in the inflow forecast occurred in May and June as the Upper Colorado River Basin experienced dry spring conditions for yet another year. Unregulated inflow into Lake Powell during the April through July runoff period in 2004 was 3.80 maf (4,840 mcm) or 48 percent of the 30 year average⁽²⁾. The volume of runoff in the basin in 2004 was reduced due to very dry antecedent soil moisture conditions resulting from four previous years of drought.

Water year 2004 marked the fifth consecutive year with below average inflow into Colorado River reservoirs. Unregulated inflow to Lake Powell was 62, 59, 25, and 51 percent of average in water years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 respectively. Reservoir storage at Lake Powell and Lake Mead declined for the fifth straight year. By the end of water year 2004, Lake Mead storage decreased by 1.51 maf (1,860 mcm). Storage in Lake Powell decreased by 2.622 maf (3,230 mcm). Storage in reservoirs upstream of Lake Powell increased by approximately 0.546 maf (673 mcm) in 2004. At the beginning of water year 2004, Colorado River total system storage was 57 percent of capacity. Total Colorado River system storage decreased by approximately 3.7 maf (4,500 mcm) during water year 2003. As of September 30, 2004, total system storage was 51 percent of capacity.

~~Even though Colorado River reservoir storage has been reduced during 2004, deliveries of water to meet obligations pursuant to applicable provisions of "The Law of the River" were maintained.~~

~~Preliminary Colorado River water delivery accounting data for calendar year (CY) 2002, compiled~~

⁽¹⁾ Unregulated inflow adjusts for the effects of operations at upstream reservoirs. It is computed by adding the change in storage, and the evaporation losses from upstream reservoirs to the observed inflow. Unregulated inflow is used because it provides an inflow time series that is not biased by upstream reservoir operations.

⁽²⁾ Inflow statistics throughout this document will be compared to the 30-year average, 1971-2000.

~~pursuant to Article V of the Decree, indicated that requests for water deliveries by agricultural users in California during CY 2002 had the potential to exceed the maximum amount of water available under the determinations made in the 2002 AOP approved and transmitted on January 14, 2002. In light of the potential for such overuse within the Lower Basin, and after consultation with members of the CRMWG, a supplement to the 2002 AOP was approved on November 22, 2002. The supplement to the 2002 AOP addressed this potential CY 2002 overuse and established appropriate conditions for repayment if Reclamation determines that any overuse occurred in CY 2002 pursuant to final Article V Decree accounting data.~~

Tables 1(a) and 1(b) list the October 1, 2004, reservoir vacant space, live storage, water elevation, percent of capacity, change in storage, and change in water elevation during water year 2004.

Table 1(a). Reservoir Conditions on October 1, 2004 (English Units)

Reservoir	Vacant Space	Live Storage	Water Elevation	Percent of Capacity	Change in Storage*	Change in Elevation*
	(maf)	(maf)	(feet)	(percent)	(maf)	(feet)
Fontenelle	0.056	0.289	6,498.7	84	0.031	4.4
Flaming Gorge	1.085	2.664	6,010.7	71	0.029	0.9
Blue Mesa	0.267	0.562	7,487.5	68	0.175	25.0
Navajo	0.650	1.045	6,033.6	62	0.311	34.2
Lake Powell	14.834	9.488	3,574.6	39	-2.622	-29.1
Lake Mead	11.765	14.112	1,127.6	55	-1.506	-14.5
Lake Mohave	0.246	1.564	638.0	86	-0.079	-3.0
Lake Havasu	0.062	0.557	446.8	90	-0.005	-0.2
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Totals	28.965	30.281		51	-3.666	

* From October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.

Table 1(b). Reservoir Conditions on October 1, 2004 (Metric Units)

Reservoir	Vacant Space	Live Storage	Water Elevation	Percent of Capacity	Change in Storage*	Change in Elevation*
	(mcm)	(mcm)	(meters)	(percent)	(mcm)	(meters)
Fontenelle	69	356	1,981	84	38	1.3
Flaming Gorge	1,338	3,286	1,832	71	36	0.3
Blue Mesa	329	693	2,282	68	216	7.6
Navajo	802	1,289	1,839	62	384	10.4
Lake Powell	18,298	11,703	1,090	39	-3,234	-8.9
Lake Mead	14,512	17,407	344	55	-1,858	-4.4
Lake Mohave	303	1,929	194	86	-97	-0.9
Lake Havasu	77	687	136	90	-6	-0.1
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Totals	35,729	37,352		51	-4,522	

* From October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.

2005 WATER SUPPLY ASSUMPTIONS

For 2005 operations, three reservoir unregulated inflow scenarios were developed and analyzed and are labeled as probable maximum, most probable, and probable minimum. The attached graphs show these inflow scenarios and associated release patterns and end of month contents for each reservoir.

Although there is considerable uncertainty associated with streamflow forecasts and reservoir operating plans made a year in advance, these projections are valuable in analyzing probable impacts on project uses and purposes. The magnitude of inflows in each of these three inflow scenarios for 2005 are below the historical upper decile, mean, and lower decile (10 percent exceedance, 50 percent exceedance, and 90 percent exceedance, respectively). The volume of inflow is reduced in each of the three scenarios, due to dry antecedent conditions in the Colorado River basin resulting from five consecutive years of below average precipitation. The National Weather Service's Ensemble Streamflow Prediction (ESP) model was used to develop inflows for the three scenarios for 2005. ESP modeling showed that even with average temperatures and precipitation in 2005, runoff in the Colorado River Basin is likely to remain below average due to dry antecedent conditions. [Most probable inflow for Lake Powell for water year 2005 is 9.29 maf \(11,500 mcm\) or 77 percent of average. Most probable inflow was reduced by 2.78 maf \(3,430 mcm\) from the 30 year average of 12.06 maf \(14,870 mcm\). Minimum probable inflow was reduced by 2.41 maf \(2,970 mcm\) from 51 percent of average \(the statistical 90 percent exceedance level\) to 31 percent of average. Maximum probable inflow was reduced by 2.98 maf \(3,680 mcm\) from 151 percent of average \(the statistical 10 percent exceedance level\) to 126 percent of average.](#) The three inflow scenarios for Lake Powell are shown in Tables 2(a) and 2(b).

The volume of inflow resulting from these assumptions was used as input into Reclamation's monthly reservoir simulation model. This model is used to plan reservoir operations for the upcoming 24-month period. Projected water year 2005 inflow and October 1, 2004, reservoir storage conditions were used as input to this model and monthly releases were adjusted until release and storage levels accomplished project purposes.

Table 2(a). Projected Unregulated Inflow
Into Lake Powell for Water Year 2005
(English Units: maf)

Time Period	Probable Maximum	Most Probable	Probable Minimum
10/03 - 12/03	1.35	1.10	0.95
1/04 - 3/04	1.45	1.16	0.90
4/04 - 7/04	10.94	6.18	1.59
8/04 - 9/04	1.44	0.85	0.26
10/04 - 12/04	1.39	1.39	1.39
WY 2005	15.18	9.29	3.70
CY 2005	15.22	9.58	4.14

Table 2(b). Projected Unregulated Inflow
Into Lake Powell for Water Year 2005
(Metric Units: mcm)

Time Period	Probable Maximum	Most Probable	Probable Minimum
10/03 - 12/03	1,667	1,357	1,171
1/04 - 3/04	1,792	1,433	1,108
4/04 - 7/04	13,490	7,625	1,964
8/04 - 9/04	1,779	1,047	321
10/04 - 12/04	1,716	1,716	1,716
WY 2005	18,728	11,460	4,564
CY 2005	18,778	11,821	5,109

2005 RESERVOIR OPERATIONS

The regulation of the Colorado River has had effects on downstream aquatic and riparian resources. Controlled releases from dams have modified temperature, sediment load, and flow patterns, resulting in increased productivity of some introduced aquatic resources and the development of economically significant sport fisheries. However, these same releases have detrimental effects on endangered and other native species. Operating strategies designed to protect and enhance downstream aquatic and riparian resources have been established at several locations in the Colorado River basin.

Modifications to planned operations may be made based on changes in forecast conditions. However, due to the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin (Upper Colorado Recovery Program), Section 7 consultations, and other downstream concerns, modification to the monthly operation plans may be based on other factors in addition to changes in streamflow forecasts. Decisions on spring peak releases and downstream habitat target flows may be made midway through the runoff season. Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service will initiate meetings with interested parties, including representatives of the Basin States, to facilitate the decisions necessary to finalize site-specific operations plans.

Reclamation completed Section 7 consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service in April 2002 on current and projected discretionary routine lower Colorado River operations and maintenance activities for a period of up to 3 years. On an annual basis, Reclamation's compliance with environmental commitments related to the April 1997 and 2002 Biological Opinions are reported to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Reclamation's compliance with additional environmental commitments, related to adoption of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, will continue to be addressed in future annual reports, as appropriate. Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service have also formed a partnership with other Federal, State, and private agencies to develop the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP). This program permits both non-Federal and Federal parties to participate and address Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance requirements under Sections 7 and 10 of the ESA. **A draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Lower Colorado River MSCP was published on _____.**

The following paragraphs discuss the operation of each of the reservoirs with respect to compact, decree, statutory water delivery obligations, and instream flow needs for maintaining or improving aquatic resources, where appropriate.

Fontenelle Reservoir

Drought conditions persisted during water year 2004 in the Upper Green River Basin for the fifth year in a row. **The April through July runoff inflow to Fontenelle during water year 2004 was 0.425 maf (524 mcm) which was 49 percent of normal. The inflow peaked at 5,000 cfs (142 cms) June 21, 2004. Releases from Fontenelle Dam reached a maximum of 1,250 cfs between May 15, 2004 and May 17, 2004. These maximum releases were entirely made through Fontenelle Power Plant which has an approximate capacity of 1,500 cfs (40 cms). The peak elevation of Fontenelle Reservoir**

during water year 2004 was 6503.6 feet above sea level which occurred on August 8, 2004. This elevation was 2.4 feet (0.73 meters) below the spillway crest elevation.

The most probable April through July inflow to Fontenelle Reservoir during water year 2005 is 0.695 maf (857 mcm). This volume far exceeds 0.345 maf (426 mcm) which is the storage capacity of Fontenelle Reservoir. For this reason, the most probable and maximum probable inflow scenarios require releases during the spring that exceed the capacity of the power plant to avoid uncontrolled spills from the reservoir. It is very likely that Fontenelle Reservoir will fill during water year 2005. In order to minimize high spring releases and to maximize downstream water resources and power production, the reservoir will most likely be drawn down to the minimum pool elevation 6463 feet above sea level (1,970 meters) by early April 2005, which corresponds to a volume of 0.093 maf (115 mcm) of live storage.

Flaming Gorge Reservoir

Inflows into Flaming Gorge Reservoir during water year 2004 were well below normal for the fifth year in a row. The annual unregulated inflow volume for water year 2004 was 0.510 maf (629 mcm) which was 43 percent of normal. The annual unregulated inflow volumes during this drought period (water year 2000 through water year 2004) were 56, 43, 31, 44 and 43 percent of normal respectively. Flaming Gorge Reservoir did not fill during water year 2004. On October 1, 2003 (the beginning of water year 2004) the reservoir elevation was 6009.8 feet above sea level (1,832 meters). The reservoir elevation remained relatively steady throughout water year 2004 and ended water year 2004 (on September 30, 2004) at an elevation of 6010.5 feet above sea level (1831.9 meters). The water year ending reservoir elevation was 29.5 feet (8.99 meters) below the full pool elevation of 6,040 feet (1,841 meters) which amounts to an available storage space of 1.132 maf (1,396 mcm).

A spring peak release of approximately 4,400 cfs (124.6 cms) was made for a period of 2 days between May 10, 2004 and May 12, 2004. This release was made through the powerplant and was closely matched to peak flows on the Yampa River. The Yampa River peaked at approximately 7,300 cfs (207 cms) on May 9, 2004. Flows on the Green River near Jensen, Utah, an important segment of the Green River for endangered fish, peaked at about 11,200 cfs (317 cms) on May 13, 2004. The two-day spring peak release for 2004 was a test release. **The Flaming Gorge Biological Opinion requires at least one week of power plant capacity releases during the spring.** By reducing the peak to two days, approximately 35,000 acre-feet (43 mcm) of water was conserved. This conserved water was released during the months of June, July and August. Releases were increased from 800 cfs (22.6 cms) to 1000 cfs (28.3 cms) during these months to provide higher base flows for endangered fish in the Green River below Flaming Gorge Dam. The release regime was considered a test release under the 1992 Biological Opinion. Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service and Western Area Power Administration **conducted informal consultations** in setting up the parameters of the test release.

In September 2000, a final report titled "Flow and Temperature Recommendations for Endangered Fishes in the Green River Downstream of Flaming Gorge Dam" (Flaming Gorge Flow Recommendations) was published by the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program. The report

compiled and summarized research conducted on endangered fish in the Green River under the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program and presents flow recommendations for three segments of the Green River. Reclamation is in the process of conducting a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to determine the best operational alternative for Flaming Gorge Dam to meet these flow recommendations. A draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was released to the public on _____. Completion of the final EIS and Record of Decision (ROD) will likely occur in the spring of 2005.

During water year 2005 Flaming Gorge Dam will be operated under the BOFG until a ROD is finalized for the Flaming Gorge EIS. At that time, operations will adopt the findings of the ROD which could impact how Flaming Gorge Dam will be operated in the future. High spring releases will continue to occur each year timed with the Yampa River followed by low summer and autumn base flows. Under the most probable scenario, releases in the winter and early spring during 2005 will be relatively low (approximately 800 cfs [23 cms]) in order to conserve reservoir storage.

Blue Mesa, Morrow Point, and Crystal Reservoirs (Aspinall Unit)

Drought conditions prevailed again in the Gunnison River Basin during water year 2004. The April through July unregulated runoff into Blue Mesa Reservoir in 2004 was only 0.460 maf (529 mcm), or 64 percent of average. Water year 2004 unregulated inflow into Blue Mesa Reservoir was 0.676 maf (834 mcm) or 68 percent of average. Even though this marks the fifth consecutive year of drought, water year 2004 had considerably more runoff volume than the record low water year set in 2002. The net effect of the 2004 runoff and the water conservation practices by water users in the basin during the year resulted in Blue Mesa Reservoir increasing in storage during the water year 2004 by 0.175 maf (216 mcm). Storage in Blue Mesa Reservoir on September 30, 2004, was 0.565 maf (693 mcm), or 68 percent of capacity.

Releases from Aspinall Unit reservoirs in 2004 were at lower than normal levels, in part, to conserve reservoir storage. Releases from the Aspinall Unit were reduced on November 6, 2003, to provide for a flow of 300 cfs (7.1 cms) in the Gunnison River through the Black Canyon (below the Gunnison Tunnel). This flow was maintained until early May 2004 at which time flows in the Black Canyon were increased to 350 cfs (8.5 cms). Water year 2004 powerplant bypasses were approximately 0.438maf (540 mcm) at Crystal Dam. These bypass releases occurred because the powerplant was shut down from mid-October, 2003 through July, 2004 for generator rewind and turbine repair.

On August 16, 1995, Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) No. 95-07-40-R1760 was signed by the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Colorado Water Conservation Board. The purpose of the MOA was to provide water to the Redlands Fish Ladder and assure at least 300 cfs (8.5 cms) of flow in the 2-mile reach of the Gunnison River between the Redlands Fish Ladder and the confluence of the Gunnison and Colorado Rivers (2-mile reach). This MOA was extended for an additional five years on June 30, 2000. A key provision of the MOA requires that the parties adopt a plan to share water shortages in dry years, when total storage at Blue Mesa Reservoir is projected to drop below 0.4 maf (493 mcm) by the end of the calendar year. In 2004 it was not

necessary to operate under a shared shortage arrangement because there was sufficient runoff.

In July 2003, a final report titled, “Flow Recommendations to Benefit Endangered Fishes in the Colorado and Gunnison Rivers” was published by the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program. The report compiles and summarizes the results of research conducted on endangered fish in the Gunnison and Upper Colorado Rivers under the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program. The report presents flow recommendations for two different river reaches: one for the lower Gunnison River between Delta and Grand Junction, Colorado as measured at Grand Junction, and the other for the Colorado River downstream of the Gunnison River confluence as measured at the Colorado-Utah state line. Reclamation published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on operations to assist in meeting the flow recommendations in January 2004, and public scoping meetings were held in February 2004. A draft EIS is likely to be released in 2006.

On January 17, 2001, the United States filed an application to quantify the federal reserved water right decreed to the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument. The water right is for flows in the Gunnison River through the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park downstream of the Gunnison Tunnel. On April 2, 2003, the Department of the Interior and State of Colorado reached agreement regarding water for the park. Under this agreement, the reserved water right filed for by the National Park Service will be quantified for 300 cfs (8.5 cms) with a 1933 priority date. The Colorado Water Conservation Board will file for additional flows, with a 2003 priority date, under the State of Colorado instream flow program, which are in excess of those required to fulfill the purposes of the Aspinall Unit, to provide additional water resources for the park. **However, this agreement is currently being challenged in the United States District Court in Colorado. The Colorado Water Court for Water Division 4 has stayed proceedings on the amended federal claim for the 300 cfs flow pending the outcome of the case before the District Court. The State of Colorado and others have challenged the Colorado Water Court stay in the Colorado Supreme Court. No action has been pursued on the Colorado Water Conservation Board’s filing for the peak flows (flows in excess of those required to fulfill the purposes of the Aspinall Unit) in the Colorado Water Court for Water Division 4 and none is anticipated until the amended federal claim is settled. In short, the reserved water right claim for the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park has not yet been quantified.**

For water year 2005 the Aspinall Unit will be operated in accordance with the Colorado River Storage Project Act to conserve storage while meeting downstream delivery requirements. Under normal conditions, the minimum release objectives of the Aspinall Unit are to meet the delivery requirements of the Uncompahgre Valley Project, maintain a year round minimum flow of 300 cfs (8.5 cms) in the Gunnison River through the Black Canyon, and maintain a minimum flow of 300 cfs (8.5 cms) in the 2-mile reach below the Redlands Diversion Dam during the months of July through October. In dry years, the 300 cfs flow through the canyon and the 2-mile reach can be reduced pursuant to the appropriate decree or MOA. In 2005, under the most probable inflow conditions, flows through the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park will be above the minimum release objective during the summer months. To protect both the blue ribbon trout fishery in the Black Canyon and recreational interests, releases during 2005 will be planned to minimize large fluctuations in the daily and monthly flows in the Gunnison River below the Gunnison Tunnel diversion.

Under the minimum probable inflow scenario, Blue Mesa Reservoir is not expected to fill in 2005. [Under the most probable](#) and maximum probable inflow scenarios, Blue Mesa Reservoir is expected to fill in 2005.

Navajo Reservoir

Drought conditions continued to persist in the San Juan River basin during 2004 which resulted in less than average runoff volumes into the basin. [The April through July unregulated inflow into Navajo Reservoir in water year 2004 was 0.625 maf \(771 mcm\), or 80 percent of average. Water year 2004 unregulated inflow was 0893 maf \(1,101 mcm\) or 80 percent of average.](#) The San Juan River basin is continuing to experience an extended dry cycle. Unregulated inflow to Navajo Reservoir in water years 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 was 40, 93, 10, and 43 percent of average, respectively. Reservoir storage in Navajo Reservoir has been significantly reduced due to these protracted drought conditions. [Reservoir live storage on September 30, 2004, was 79 percent of capacity but only 37 percent of active capacity. The water surface elevation at Navajo Reservoir on September 30, 2004, was 6033.45 feet \(1,839.0 meters\).](#)

The final report titled Flow Recommendations for the San Juan River (Flow Recommendations), which outlines flow recommendations for the San Juan River below Navajo Dam, was completed by the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program (SJ RIP) in May 1999. The report synthesizes research conducted on endangered fish in the San Juan River over a 7-year period. The purpose of the report is to provide flow recommendations for the San Juan River that promote the recovery of the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker, maintain important habitat for these two species, as well as the other native species, and provide information for the evaluation of continued water development potential in the basin. The Fish and Wildlife Service in June 2004 issued a non-jeopardy draft biological opinion for the operations of Navajo Dam to meet the Flow Recommendations, or reasonable alternative.

Due to the severity of the drought, the hydrologic conditions in the San Juan River basin during the spring runoff period, the Flow Recommendations did not provide for making a spring peak release from Navajo Reservoir in 2004. Although there was no peak release, at times higher than normal base flows were released from Navajo Reservoir during the spring and summer months during water year 2004. [Releases from Navajo Reservoir from June through August of 2004 averaged 463 cfs \(13.1 cms\) and were as high as 717 cfs \(20.3 cms\) in mid-August.](#) These releases were necessary due to decreasing flows in the San Juan River endangered fish critical habitat area (Farmington to Lake Powell). The Flow Recommendations call for an average weekly flow of between 500 cfs (14 cms) and 1,000 cfs (28 cms) in this reach of the river; however, because of the poor water supply conditions at Navajo Reservoir, the SJ RIP and the Fish and Wildlife Service concurred in providing a lesser base flow of 400 cfs through the critical habitat reach during the 2004 irrigation season only, which flow is deemed sufficient to maintain endangered fish populations and habitat in the San Juan River through the critical habitat reach for the designated time period. With minimal tributary inflow to the San Juan River below Navajo Dam (primarily the Animas River) in 2004, this flow, as well as the flow required to meet downstream demands and natural losses, had to be made up almost entirely of releases from Navajo Reservoir.

In response to the extremely low storage level in Navajo Reservoir, coupled with a less-than-average predicted inflow in 2004, a shortage sharing agreement was developed among water users in 2004. The 2004 shortage sharing recommendations were similar to the agreement that was developed in 2003. Ten major water users, including the Jicarilla Apache and Navajo Nations, Hammond Conservancy District, Public Service Company of New Mexico, City of Farmington, Arizona Public Service Company, BHP-Billiton, Bloomfield Irrigation District, Farmers Mutual Ditch, and Jewett Valley Ditch, endorsed the recommendations which included limitations on diversions for 2004, criteria for determining a shortage, and shortage-sharing requirements in the event of a water supply shortfall, including sharing of shortages between the water users and the flow demands for endangered fish habitat. In addition to the ten major water users, the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program all provided input to the recommendations, and the recommendations were accepted for reservoir operation and river administration purposes by Reclamation and the New Mexico State Engineer.

The criteria used for determining a water shortage in 2004 was based on protecting elevation 5,990 feet (the top of the inactive pool) at Navajo Reservoir, with future inflows assumed to be at minimum probable levels (90 percent exceedance). When the water surface elevation at Navajo Reservoir was projected to fall below 5,990 feet in 2004, with projected inflows at the minimum probable level, a water supply shortfall was determined. The shortage calculations were updated frequently as runoff forecasts changed and actual runoff materialized. Because of sufficient inflow into Navajo Reservoir in 2004, no shortages were realized during the 2004 water year.

Reclamation is proceeding through a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process on the implementation of an operation at Navajo Dam that meets the Flow Recommendations or a reasonable alternative to them. A Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was filed on October 1, 1999, in the Federal Register. A draft EIS was released on September 4, 2002. The completion of the final EIS is scheduled to occur in _____ 2004 with the Record of Decision to follow a minimum of 30 days thereafter.

In March 2004, a contract was awarded to Gracon Corporation for the repair of the 4' x 4' tandem outlet gates at Navajo Dam. The work is expected to be completed in November 2004.

Navajo Reservoir is not expected to fill in 2005 under the minimum probable or most probable inflow scenario. Under the maximum probable inflow scenario, Navajo Reservoir would fill in 2005. Releases from the reservoir will likely be 250 cfs (7 cms) through the fall and winter, subject to NEPA compliance. Assuming average inflow conditions in 2005, a large spring release as provided for in the Flow Recommendations is likely in 2005.

Lake Powell

Five years of drought in the Colorado River Basin has significantly reduced water storage in Lake Powell. When drought conditions began in the autumn of 1999, Lake Powell was nearly full (95 percent of capacity on September 30, 1999). As water year 2004 ended on September 30, 2004,

Lake Powell storage had been reduced to 9.49 maf (11,700 mcm) or 39 percent of capacity.

Lake Powell began water year 2004 with 12.1 maf (14,900 mcm) of water in storage (50 percent of capacity). Storage in Lake Powell at that time was 3.51 maf (4,330 mcm) lower than that of Lake Mead. Because of reduced storage, and Lake Powell storage being less than Lake Mead storage, releases from Glen Canyon Dam were scheduled to maintain the minimum release objective from Lake Powell of 8.23 maf (10,150 mcm) for water year 2004 in accordance with Article II(2) of the Operating Criteria. Forecasted inflow to Lake Powell was below average throughout water year 2004, and storage equalization releases between Lake Mead and Lake Powell were not required. The total release from Lake Powell in water year 2003 was 8.23 maf (10,150 mcm).

April through July unregulated inflow into Lake Powell in water year 2004 was 3.80 maf (4,690 mcm), or 48 percent of average. Water year 2004 unregulated inflow was 6.34 maf (7,830 mcm), or 53 percent of average. Lake Powell reached a seasonal peak elevation of 3,589.0 feet (1,093.9 meters), 111.0 feet from full, on June 15, 2004. The elevation of Lake Powell on September 30, 2004, was 3,574.6 feet (1,089.5 meters), 125.4 feet from full. The water surface of Lake Powell had not been this low since 1970, prior to the reservoir's first filling in 1980.

In 2003 and 2004, Reclamation conducted a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to study the effects of implementing an interim 602(a) storage guideline to assist in the determination of the quantity of water considered necessary as of September 30 of each year as required by Section 602(a) of the *Colorado River Basin Project Act*. The guideline was originally proposed by the Colorado River Basin States (65 Federal Register 48537, August 8, 2000). A Final Environmental Assessment titled "Adoption of an Interim 602(a) Storage Guideline" was completed in March, 2004. A Finding of No Significant Impact was approved by the Regional Directors of Reclamation's Upper and Lower Colorado Regions in March, 2004. Under the Interim 602(a) Guideline, 602(a) storage requirements determined in accordance with Article II (1) of the Operating Criteria will utilize a value of not less than 14.85 maf (elevation 3,630 feet) for Lake Powell through the year 2016. The Interim 602(a) Storage Guideline will assist in the implementation of Article II(1) of the Operating Criteria.

On April 24, 2002, members of the Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG) recommended to the Secretary that an experimental flow test be made from Glen Canyon Dam beginning in water year 2003. The recommendation addressed the decline of two key resources in the Grand Canyon: sediment and population viability of endangered humpback chub. Reclamation, the National Park Service, and the United States Geological Survey jointly prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) under NEPA to document the impacts of these proposed experimental flows. The Proposed Experimental Releases from Glen Canyon Dam and Removal of Non-Native Fish EA (September 2002) incorporates a Biological Assessment for the Fish and Wildlife Service under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). A Finding of No Significant Impact on the experimental releases was signed by the three agencies on December 6, 2002.

Daily high fluctuating releases from Glen Canyon Dam, as part of the experimental flows, were carried out from January through March, 2004. Releases during this three month period ranged between a high of 20,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) to a low of 5,000 cfs each day. The January

through March high fluctuating releases were intended to benefit the endangered humpback chub by reducing the spawning and recruitment of nonnative fish. These high fluctuating releases were also implemented from January through March, 2003. The AMWG has been presented with proposals that additional high fluctuating test releases be implemented in the future. However, it is unlikely that high fluctuating releases will be implemented in 2005.

Retention of sediment in the Grand Canyon is also an aspect of the experimental flows. If significant sediment input (over one million metric tons) to the Grand Canyon from the Paria River occurs in the summer or fall of 2004, and 800,000 metric tons are retained by January 1, 2005, as described in the EA, a 2-day test release of 42,000 to 45,000 cfs from Glen Canyon Dam will be made in January 2005, as part of the experimental flows, to understand mobilization of sediment and beach and habitat creation in the Grand Canyon corridor. Additionally, the 2-day test releases of 42,000 to 45,000 cfs would occur in January through March of 2005 if winter sediment inputs exceed 800,000 metric tons as described in the EA. Test releases to mobilize sediment did not occur in 2004 because the required sediment input from the Paria River was not achieved.

During water year 2005, the minimum release objective of 8.23 maf (10,150 mcm) will be made under the most probable, minimum probable, and maximum probable inflow conditions. If inflow to Lake Powell is greater than the maximum probable inflow volume, releases greater than 8.23 maf (10,150 mcm) will be made in 2005 to equalize storage between Lakes Powell and Mead, if storage in Lake Powell is projected to be greater than 14.85 maf (elevation 3,630 feet) on September 30, 2005. Under most probable inflow in 2005, the projected water surface elevation at Lake Powell on September 30, 2005 will be 3,578.5 feet (1090.7 meters) with 9.81 maf (12,100 mcm) of storage (40 percent of capacity). Experimental flows in 2005 will not alter the total volume of water to be released from Lake Powell during water year 2005.

Because of less than full storage conditions in Lake Powell resulting from five consecutive years of below normal runoff, releases for dam safety purposes are highly unlikely in 2005. If implemented, releases greater than powerplant capacity would be made consistent with the 1956 Colorado River Storage Project Act, the 1968 Colorado River Basin Project Act, and the 1992 Grand Canyon Protection Act. Reservoir releases in excess of powerplant capacity required for dam safety purposes during high reservoir conditions may be used to accomplish the objectives of the Beach/Habitat Building Flow according to the terms contained in the Glen Canyon Dam ROD, and as published in the Glen Canyon Dam Operating Criteria (62 Federal Register 9447, Mar. 3, 1997).

Daily and hourly releases in 2005 will be made according to the parameters of the ROD for the Glen Canyon Dam Final Environmental Impact Statement (GCDFEIS) preferred alternative and the Glen Canyon Dam Operating Criteria, as shown in Table 3. Exceptions to these parameters may be made during power system emergencies, or for purposes of humanitarian search and rescue. Experimental flows implemented in 2005 may also require that releases exceed the parameters of the Glen Canyon Dam Operating Criteria during the winter months of 2005.

Table 3. Glen Canyon Dam Release Restrictions (Glen Canyon Dam Operating Criteria)

--	--	--	--

<u>Parameter</u>	(cfs)	(cms)	<u>Conditions</u>
Maximum flow ⁽³⁾	25,000	708.0	
Minimum flow	5,000	141.6	Nighttime
	8,000	226.6	7:00 am to 7:00 pm
Ramp rates			
Ascending	4,000	113.3	per hour
Descending	1,500	42.5	per hour
Daily fluctuations ⁽⁴⁾	5,000 / 8,000	141.6 / 226.6	

Releases from Lake Powell in water year 2005 will continue to reflect consideration of the uses and purposes identified in the authorizing legislation for Glen Canyon Dam. Powerplant releases and Beach/Habitat Building Flows will reflect criteria based on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations made in the ROD for the GCDFEIS pursuant to the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992, and NEPA documentation regarding the April 24, 2002, AMWG experimental flow proposal.

Lake Mead

For calendar year 2004, the Partial Domestic Surplus condition was the criterion governing the operation of Lake Mead in accordance with Article III(3)(b) of the Operating Criteria, Article II(B)(2) of the Decree, and Section 2(B)(2) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines. A volume of 1.5 maf (1,850 mcm) of water was scheduled for delivery to Mexico in accordance with Article 15 of the 1944 U.S.-Mexico Treaty and Minute No. 242 of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

Lake Mead began water year 2004 at elevation [1,142.12 feet \(348 meters\)](#), with [15.6 maf \(19,243 mcm\)](#) in storage, [60](#) percent of the conservation capacity of 25.877 maf (31,919 mcm). During the year, Lake Mead steadily declined and reached its minimum elevation of [1127.90 feet \(344 meters\)](#) at the end of [September 2004](#), with [14.1 maf \(17,392\)](#) in storage, [54](#) percent of capacity.

⁽³⁾ May be exceeded during beach/habitat building flows, habitat maintenance flows, or when necessary to manage above average hydrologic conditions.

⁽⁴⁾ Daily fluctuations limit is 5,000 cfs (141.6 cms) for months with release volumes less than 0.600 maf (740 mcm); 6,000 cfs (169.9 cms) for monthly release volumes of 0.600 to 0.800 maf (740 to 987 mcm); and 8,000 cfs (226.6 cms) for monthly volumes over 0.800 maf (990 mcm).

The total release from Lake Mead through Hoover Dam during water year 2004 was 9.46 maf (11,669 mcm). Calendar year 2004 total release is projected to be 9.34 maf (11,521 mcm). Consumptive use from Lake Mead during calendar year 2004 by the Robert Griffith Water Project is projected to be 0.291 maf (359 mcm).

Under the most probable inflow conditions during water year 2005, Lake Mead will be at its maximum elevation of 1129.26 feet (344 meters) at the end of October 2004 and will decline during the water year to reach its minimum elevation of 1114.17 feet (339 meters) at the end of July 2005. Releases from Lake Mead for water year 2005 are projected to be 9.32 maf (11,496 mcm). For the 2005 calendar year, total releases are projected to be 9.38 maf (11,570 mcm). For the purpose of projections, estimated releases are based on the Partial Domestic Surplus condition as the criterion governing the operation of Lake Mead. No flood control releases would be required during water year 2005 under any of the three inflow scenarios.

The Interim Surplus Guidelines Record of Decision included ESA conservation measures. One such conservation measure specified in Article X(4)(1) includes provisions for spawning razorback suckers in Lake Mead. Reclamation continues to provide funding and support for the ongoing Lake Mead Razorback Sucker study. The focus of the study has been on locating populations of razorbacks in Lake Mead, documenting use and availability of spawning areas at various water elevations, continuing ageing studies, and confirming recruitment events. No changes in operations were made in water year 2004 to provide rising spring water surface elevations for spawning razorback suckers as there were no storage equalization releases or Beach/Habitat Building Flows during this timeframe. Based on the anticipated operation of Lake Powell for water year 2005, no changes in operations to provide rising elevations are expected in the spring of 2005.

Lakes Mohave and Havasu

At the beginning of water year 2004, Lake Mohave was at an elevation of 640.95 feet (195.4 meters), with an active storage of 1.643 maf (2,027 mcm). The water level of Lake Mohave was regulated as needed between elevation 634 feet (193.24 meters) and 645 feet (196.06 meters) throughout the water year, ending at an elevation of 638.00 feet (194.5 meters) with 1.564 maf (1,929 mcm) in storage. The total release from Lake Mohave through Davis Dam for water year 2004 was 9.31 maf (11,484 mcm) for downstream water use requirements. Calendar year 2004 total release is projected to be 9.03 maf (11,139 mcm).

For water year 2005, Davis Dam is expected to release 8.95 maf (11,040 mcm). For the 2005 calendar year, releases are projected to be 9.02 maf (11,126 mcm). The water level in Lake Mohave will be regulated between an elevation of 630 feet (192.02 meters) and 645 feet (196.06 meters).

Lake Havasu started water year 2004 at an elevation of 447.05 feet (136.26 meters), with 0.562 maf (693 mcm) in storage. The water level of Lake Havasu was regulated as needed between elevation 445 feet (135.6 meters) and 449 feet (136.9 meters). During the water year, 6.91 maf (8,523 mcm) was released from Parker Dam. Calendar year 2004 total release is projected to be 6.93 maf (8,548 mcm). Diversions from Lake Havasu during calendar year 2004 by the Central Arizona Project

(CAP) and the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) are projected to be 1.57 maf (1,937 mcm) and 0.538 maf (664 mcm), respectively.

For water year 2005, Parker Dam is expected to release 6.93 maf (8,548 mcm). For the 2005 calendar year, releases are projected to also be 6.93 maf (8,548 mcm). Diversions from Lake Havasu in calendar year 2005 by MWD and CAP are expected to be 0.512 maf (632 mcm) and 1.6 maf (1,974 mcm), respectively.

Mohave and Havasu Reservoirs are scheduled to be drawn down in the late summer and winter months to provide storage space for local storm runoff and will be filled in the spring to meet higher summer water needs. This drawdown will also correspond with maintenance at both Davis and Parker powerplants which is scheduled for September through February. During 2005, Lake Mohave will continue to be operated under the constraints as described in the Biological and Conference Opinion on Lower Colorado River Operations and Maintenance. Reclamation, as provided in the Interim Surplus Guidelines Record of Decision, will continue these existing operations in Lake Mohave that benefit native fish through the effective period of the Interim Surplus Guidelines and will explore additional ways to provide benefits to native fish. The normal filling pattern of these two reservoirs coincides well with the fishery spawning period. Since lake elevations will be typical of previous years, normal conditions are expected for boating and other recreational uses.

Reclamation is the lead agency in the Native Fish Work Group, a multiagency group of scientists attempting to augment the ageing stock of the endangered razorback sucker in Lake Mohave. Larval razorback suckers are captured by hand in and around spawning areas in late winter and early spring for rearing at Willow Beach Fish Hatchery below Hoover Dam. The following year, one year old razorback suckers are placed into predator-free, lake-side backwaters for rearing through the spring and summer. When the lake is normally drawn down during the fall, these fish are harvested from these rearing areas and then released to the lake. The razorback suckers grow very quickly, usually exceeding ten inches in length by September.

In 2003, 16,843 razorback suckers (300 mm minimum size) were repatriated into Lake Mohave from all sources. In 2004, 25,418 wild larvae were captured from natural spawning congregations on Lake Mohave and delivered to Willow Beach Hatchery.

Senator Wash and Laguna Reservoirs

Operations at Senator Wash Reservoir allow regulation of water deliveries to United States and Mexican water users downstream of Imperial Dam. The reservoir is utilized as an off-stream storage facility to meet downstream water demands and to conserve water for future uses in the United States and the scheduled uses of Mexico in accordance with Treaty obligations. Senator Wash Reservoir is the only major storage facility below Parker Dam (approximately 142 river miles downstream) and has storage capacity of 13,836 acre-feet at full pool elevation of 251 feet, mean sea level. Operational objectives are to store excess flows from the river which have been caused by water user cutbacks and side wash inflows due to rain. Stored waters are utilized to meet irrigation and Treaty demands.

~~Elevation restrictions on Senator Wash Reservoir reduce the flexibility of water storage in the lower reaches of the river. In August of 1992, a restriction at elevation 240 feet, mean sea level, (9,144 acre-feet of storage) at Senator Wash Reservoir was put in place. This was due to potential piping and liquefaction of foundation and embankment materials at West Squaw Lake Dike and Senator Wash Dam. A filter blanket at West Squaw Lake dike was constructed during the first part of CY 2000, and a reservoir fill test was started September 15 and concluded on October 19, 2000. The test had to be stopped due to piping concerns at West Squaw Lake Dike. Therefore, Senator Wash was not available most of CY 2000 to regulate river flows and excess flows to Mexico exceeded 300,000 acre-feet for the year. After the fill test in CY 2000, a new elevation restriction at 235 feet (7,330 acre-feet of storage) was put in place, and excess flows to Mexico were reduced to about 200,000 AF in CY 2001. In CY 2002 a permanent filter blanket was placed at West Squaw Lake Dike, additional instrumentation was put in place, and another fill test was conducted from April through July 7, 2002. Senator Wash was not available for river regulation essentially from the first of CY 2002 until July 7, 2002. Due to the success of this fill test, the elevation restriction was raised back to elevation 240 feet on July 8, 2002.~~

Beginning in 1992, elevation restrictions have been placed on Senator Wash due to potential piping and liquefaction of foundation and embankment materials at West Squaw Lake Dike and Senator Wash Dam. Currently, Senator Wash is restricted to an elevation of 240 feet (9,144 acre-feet of storage) for no more than 10 days at a time. The risk analysis update report, "Report of Findings Senator Wash Dam" dated June 30, 2003, from Reclamation's Technical Service Center (TSC) recommended that Senator Wash be restricted to elevation 235 feet (7,330 acre-feet of storage) unless the permanent West Squaw Lake Dike filter blanket that was constructed in CY 2002 is extended to the east. This filter blanket extension is scheduled to be in place by August 1, 2004.

Laguna Reservoir is a regulating storage facility located approximately 5 river miles downstream of Imperial Dam. Operational objectives are similar to those for Senator Wash Reservoir. The storage capability of Laguna Reservoir has diminished from about 1,500 acre-feet to about 400 acre-feet due to sediment accumulation and vegetation growth. Sediment accumulation in the reservoir has occurred primarily due to flood releases that occurred in 1983 and 1984, and flood control or space building releases that occurred between 1985 and 1988 and from 1997 through 1999. Dredging of the Laguna Reservoir to increase its storage capacity is scheduled to begin around CY 2005. Maintenance dredging of the Laguna Desilting Basin, located above Laguna Dam, was started during CY2003 and will continue into CY 2005. It is also planned to lengthen the desilting basin at Laguna by about 1,500 feet in CY 2005.

Imperial Dam

Imperial Dam is the last diversion dam on the Colorado River for United States water users. From the head works at Imperial Dam, the diversions of flows for American water users and Mexico occur into the All American Canal on the California side, and into the Gila Gravity Main Canal on the

Arizona side of the dam. These diversions supply all the irrigation districts in the Yuma area, in Wellton-Mohawk, in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys, and through Pilot Knob to the Northerly International Boundary (NIB) to the Mexicali Valley in Mexico. The diversions also supply much of the domestic and industrial water needs in the Yuma area. In CY 2003 approximately 5.780 maf (7.123 mcm) arrived at Imperial Dam; approximately 5.764 maf (7.101 mcm) is estimated to arrive at Imperial Dam in CY 2004.

Yuma Desalting Plant

The Yuma Desalting Plant (YDP) was not operated in CY 2004 and is being maintained in a ready reserve status. In calendar year 2003, the amount of water discharged through the Main Outlet Drain (bypass flows) was 116,477 acre-feet at an approximate concentration of total dissolved solids (TDS) of 2553 ppm. The U.S. recognizes that it has an obligation to replace, as appropriate, the bypass flows. Reclamation is preparing a report for Congress that explores options for replacement of the bypass flows from Wellton-Mohawk, including options that would not require operation of the Yuma Desalting Plant. Existing data suggests that operation of the YDP would negatively affect the Cienega de Santa Clara, a wetland of approximately 14,000 acres that is within a Biosphere Reserve in the Republic of Mexico. Reclamation's Yuma Area Office has initiated an environmental planning effort that will determine the extent of the effects.

A short section of the Main Outlet Drain Extension (MODE) near the confluence with the Gila River was damaged during the 1993 Gila River flood and still needs to be repaired. However, seepage from the drain is less than one percent of the ground water flow in the area and is not significantly affecting the quality of the ground water or the Colorado River water. All of Wellton-Mohawk's drainage flows are expected to be contained in the MODE for CY 2004 and CY 2005.

Located at the Yuma Desalting Plant is a research facility known as the Water Quality Improvement Center (WQIC). The primary role of the WQIC is to find ways to reduce operating costs of the YDP. To do this, Reclamation personnel who work in the WQIC investigate new technologies and processes, and explore improvements in operational and maintenance efficiencies. The WQIC also serves as a key component in Reclamation's Science and Technology program-hosting third party research to enhance the spread of publicly-developed water treatment technology into private industry. This program serves Reclamation in two ways: it reduces the overall cost of maintaining the YDP by performing research for paying outside parties pursuing similar interests, and it helps guarantee additional water supplies by supporting the proliferation of water-stretching treatment technology throughout the U.S. In addition, the WQIC serves as the primary water provider to the Yuma Area Office. The facility purifies about one million gallons per day of drainage water delivered either from the MODE, groundwater pumped from an on-site well, or Colorado River water. The WQIC will continue to operate during calendar year 2005.

Delivery of Water to Mexico

Total delivery to Mexico for CY 2003 was approximately 1.561 MAF, an over-delivery of approximately 61,000 AF. Of that amount, approximately 140,000 AF were delivered at the

Southerly International Boundary (SIB) and 641 AF (including conveyance losses) to Tijuana. As of June, 2004, over deliveries to Mexico have been about 28,000 AF and are expected to be about 60,000 AF for CY 2004. It is anticipated that approximately 140,000 AF will be delivered at SIA and 651 AF will be delivered at Tijuana in CY 2004.

To further improve control of the deliveries of water from Parker Dam, Senator Wash will continue to be operated at a lower elevation (below the minimum power pool) to capture additional excess flows at Imperial Dam. Improvements to the river routing software used to schedule the releases from Parker Dam may also reduce the uncertainty in the flows arriving at Imperial Dam. Other storage options are also being investigated, primarily the proposed construction of reservoir storage near the All American Canal.

Measures that are being taken to ensure that the salinity differential requirements at NIB will be met include reducing drainage pumping in the South Gila Valley in areas with more than adequate depths to groundwater; returning some drainage flows from the Yuma Mesa Conduit to the Yuma Valley Drainage System and thence to the boundary pumping plant at the Southerly International Boundary (SIB) with Mexico; ensuring that no drainage water from the MODE will be spilled to the Colorado River; and reducing drainage pumping from the Yuma Mesa Well Field when necessary near areas with acceptable depths to groundwater (generally wells YM 10-13). In December of 2003, several drainage wells in the Yuma area were shut off to ensure that the salinity differential for the Mexican count would not exceed 151 ppm. The final salinity differential at NIB for CY 2004 was _____ ppm.

As a matter of comity, the United States has agreed to reduce the salinity flow delivered at SIB during four months of the year. Those four months will be determined by Mexico. As a means of accomplishing this, the United States constructed a diversion channel to bypass up to 8,000 AF of Yuma Valley drainage water during the four critical months identified by Mexico. This water will be replaced by better quality water from the 242 wellfields to reduce the salinity at SIB. Currently, all of the facilities required to monitor the flow and salinity deliver to SIB have not been installed or calibrated.

Colorado River Channel Aggradation Below Gila River Confluence

The 1993 Gila River flood deposited approximately 10 million cubic yards of sediment in the Colorado River between its confluence with the Gila River and Morelos Dam. An additional unspecified volume of sediment was deposited in the river channel below Morelos Dam. The aggradation of the channel substantially reduced the river's capability to carry flood flows and to act as a drain for groundwater, and has occasionally caused operational problems with the delivery of Treaty water to Mexico at Morelos Dam.

The Yuma Area Office developed a project proposal to address the aggradation problems in cooperation with local irrigation districts, the IBWC, Native American tribes, local environmental organizations, local governments, and other State and Federal agencies.

The overall project has been developed in phases. Phase 1 of the project was completed in late 1997 so the channel below Morelos Dam could accommodate flood control releases from Hoover Dam during the winters of 1997 and 1998. Phase 1 consisted of limited clearing of a flow path in the channel below Morelos Dam and realignment of the channel upstream of Yuma at River Mile 31, where the levee was in danger of being breached during high flows.

Phase 2 of the project began in September 1999. Phase 2 consisted of dredging in the river channel immediately upstream of Morelos Dam to a location about one mile above the NIB. The dredging alleviated most of the operational problems due to sediment being delivered to Mexico at Morelos Dam, and the channel capacity was increased in this reach of the river. Phase 2 was completed in April of 2001.

Current sediment load analysis indicates that the work described for Phases 3 and 4 will not be necessary in the foreseeable future. Due to the dynamic nature of the river system, periodic review would be prudent, especially after a natural flood event or after space building and flood control releases.

~~Limitrophe Division Below Morelos Dam~~

~~The IBWC has initiated the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to address the work necessary to develop and undertake a boundary preservation project within the Limitrophe section of the Colorado River. The flood events of 1983 and 1993 have changed the course of the river and deposited approximately 10 million cubic yards of material within the first 5.5 miles of the river below Morelos Dam, affecting the carrying capacity of the river and contributing to higher groundwater levels in the Yuma Valley. The EIS will identify the best U.S./Mexico alternative to be undertaken for the proposed project.~~

~~The following schedule is proposed for the IBWC EIS.~~

Feb 3, 1999	Meeting with cooperators and resource agencies
May 21, 1999	Notice of Intent
Jun 9, 1999	Public scoping meeting
Aug 15, 2000	Development of maps for boundary alignments and significant habitat
Dec 7, 2001	Bi-national meeting on proposed alignments and land use and environmental data from Mexico
Jan 22, 2002	Presentation to all Resource agencies on preliminary alignment alternatives/plan
July 8, 2004	Notice of availability of draft EIS in Federal Register
July 27, 2004	Public meeting on draft EIS
Nov 16, 2004	File final EIS
Jan 3, 2005	Record of Decision

2005 DETERMINATIONS

The AOP provides guidance regarding reservoir storage and release conditions during the upcoming year, based upon congressionally mandated and authorized storage, release, and delivery criteria and determinations. After meeting these requirements, specific reservoir releases may be modified within these requirements as forecasted inflows change in response to climatic variability and to provide additional benefits coincident to the projects' multiple purposes.

Upper Basin Reservoirs

The minimum objective release criterion will control the annual release from Glen Canyon Dam during water year 2005 in accordance with Article II(2) of the Operating Criteria unless spill avoidance and/or the storage equalization criteria in Article II(3) is controlling. Under the most probable, probable minimum, and **probable maximum inflow** scenario, Glen Canyon Dam will release the minimum objective of 8.23 maf (10,150 mcm).

Section 602(a)(3) of the *Colorado River Basin Project Act* provides for the storage of Colorado River water in Upper Basin reservoirs that the Secretary finds necessary to assure deliveries to comply with Articles III(c) and III(d) of the 1922 *Colorado River Compact*, without impairment to the annual consumptive use in the Upper Basin. The Operating Criteria provide that the annual plan of operation shall include a determination of the quantity of water considered necessary to be in Upper Basin storage at the end of the water year.

- ~~• to the extent it can be reasonably applied in the States of the Lower Division to the uses specified in Article III(e) of the 1922 *Colorado River Compact*, but these releases will not be made when the active storage in Lake Powell is less than the active storage in Lake Mead,~~
- ~~• to maintain, as nearly as practicable, active storage in Lake Mead equal to the active storage in Lake Powell, and~~
- ~~• to avoid anticipated spills from Lake Powell.~~

Taking into consideration all relevant factors required by Section 602(a)(3) of the *Colorado River Basin Project Act*, the Operating Criteria, and the Interim 602(a) Storage Guideline, it is determined that the active storage in Upper Basin reservoirs forecast for September 30, 2005, under the most probable inflow scenario, would not exceed the storage required under Section 602(a) of the *Colorado River Basin Project Act*. Consistent with Section V of the Interim 602(a) Storage Guideline, releases from Lake Powell greater than the minimum objective of 8.23 maf (10,150 mcm), to maintain, as nearly as practicable, active storage in Lake Mead equal to the active storage in Lake Powell, will be made if storage in Lake Powell, on September 30, 2005, is projected to be greater than 14.85 maf (water surface elevation 3,630 feet), and active storage in Lake Powell is greater than active storage in Lake Mead.

Lower Basin Reservoirs

Pursuant to the Operating Criteria and consistent with the Decree, water shall be released or pumped from Lake Mead to meet the following requirements:

- (a) 1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty obligations
- (b) Reasonable beneficial consumptive use requirements of mainstream users in the Lower Division States
- (c) Net river losses
- (d) Net reservoir losses
- (e) Regulatory wastes
- (f) Flood control.

The Operating Criteria provide that after the commencement of delivery of mainstream water by means of the CAP, the Secretary will determine the extent to which the reasonable beneficial consumptive use requirements of mainstream users are met in the Lower Division States. The reasonable beneficial consumptive use requirements are met depending on whether a Normal, Surplus, or Shortage condition has been determined. The Normal condition is defined as annual pumping and release from Lake Mead sufficient to satisfy 7.500 maf (9,251 mcm) of consumptive use in accordance with Article III(3)(a) of the Operating Criteria and Article II(B)(1) of the Decree. The Surplus condition is defined as annual pumping and release from Lake Mead sufficient to satisfy in excess of 7.500 maf (9,251 mcm) consumptive use in accordance with Article III(3)(b) of the Operating Criteria and Article II(B)(2) of the Decree.

The Interim Surplus Guidelines, which became effective February 26, 2001 and were first utilized in CY 2002, serve to implement the narrative provisions of Article III(3)(b) of the Operating Criteria and Article II(B)(2) of the Decree for the period through 2016. These specific interim surplus guidelines will be used annually by the Secretary to determine the quantity of water available for use within the Lower Division States.

Article II(B)(6) of the Decree allows the Secretary to allocate water that is apportioned to one Lower Division State, but is for any reason unused in that State, to another Lower Division State. This determination is made for one year only and no rights to recurrent use of the water accrue to the state that receives the allocated water. As provided in the Interim Surplus Guidelines, Section 1(B), before making a determination of a Surplus condition under these Guidelines, the Secretary will determine the quantity of apportioned but unused water from the basic apportionments, based on the best available information at the time. Reclamation does not anticipate any available unused apportionment for calendar year 2005 at this time. ~~However, if any unused apportionment is available the Secretary shall allocate any available unused apportionment for calendar year 2005 in accordance with Article II(B)(6) of the Decree and Section 1(B) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines.~~

In accordance with 43 CFR Part 414 (Offstream Storage of Colorado River Water; Development and Release of Intentionally Created Unused Apportionment in the Lower Division States: Final Rule), Intentionally Created Unused Apportionment (ICUA) may be made available by a Lower Division state for use in another Lower Division state via a Storage and Interstate Release Agreement (SIRA) with the Secretary. On December 18, 2002, the United States, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, executed a SIRA with the Arizona Water Banking Authority (AWBA),

the Southern Nevada Water Authority, and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada. Assuming all requirements are met, the Secretary will make up to 20,000 acre-feet of ICUA available to the consuming entity (Southern Nevada Water Authority) from the storing entity (Arizona Water Banking Authority) in 2005. A SIRA is currently under development between AWBA and MWD.

~~Consistent with Section 5(B) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, surplus determinations under Section 2(B)(1) Partial Domestic Surplus and Section 2(B)(2) Full Domestic Surplus were suspended on January 1, 2003. The suspension of surplus determinations under Sections 2(B)(1) and 2(B)(2) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines remained in effect until October 10, 2003, at which time California completed all required actions pursuant to Section 5(B) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines. Consistent with Section 5(B) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, the interim surplus determinations under Sections 2(B)(1) and 2(B)(2) were reinstated on October 10, 2003. The October 10, 2003 Colorado River Water Delivery Agreement provides for California to make the water use reductions reflected in Section 5(C) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines.~~

Consistent with Section 7 of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, the August 2003 24-Month Study was used to project the system storage and projected uses on January 1, 2005. Based on this projection, the _____ will govern releases for use in the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California during calendar year 2005 in accordance with [Article III\(3\)\(b\)](#) of the Operating Criteria and [Article II\(B\)\(2\) of the Decree, subject to Section 5\(C\)](#) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines.

Given the limitation of available supply, and the low inflow amounts within the Colorado River basin, the Secretary, through Reclamation, will continue to review Lower Basin operations to assure that all deliveries and diversions of mainstream water are in strict accordance with the Decree, applicable statutes, contracts, rules, and agreements.

~~For informational purposes, the natural inflow required to reach a Quantified Surplus (70R value strategy) on January 1, 2005, is 34.0 maf (41,939 cmm), which has been exceeded in the historical record less than 1 percent of the time. As provided in Article IV(1) of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, the 70R strategy involves assuming a 70 percent nonexceedance inflow into Lake Powell, subtracting out the consumptive uses and system losses and checking the results to see if all of the water could be stored or if flood control releases from Lake Mead would be required. If flood control releases from Lake Mead would be required, additional water is made available to the Lower Division States beyond a Full Domestic Surplus. The notation 70R refers to the natural inflow into Lake Powell that has been exceeded 30 percent of the time (17.4 maf).~~

As provided in Section 3 of the Interim Surplus Guidelines, the Secretary shall undertake a “mid-year review” pursuant to Article I(2) of the Operating Criteria, allowing for the revision of the current AOP, as appropriate, based on actual runoff conditions which are greater than projected, or demands which are lower than projected. The Secretary shall revise the determination for the current year only to allow for additional deliveries. Any revision in the AOP may occur only after a reinitiation of the AOP consultation process as required by law.

1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty

Under most probable inflow conditions, water in excess of that required to supply uses in the United States will not be available, therefore there will be no Colorado River Surplus, as defined by the 1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty, for delivery to Mexico. Vacant storage space in mainstem reservoirs is substantially greater than that required by flood control regulations. Therefore, a volume of 1.5 maf (1,850 mcm) of water will be available to be scheduled for delivery to Mexico during calendar year 2003 in accordance with Article 15 of the 1944 U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty. ~~and~~ In accordance with Minute No. 242 of the International Boundary and Water Commission, up to 140,000 acre-feet (173 mcm) will be delivered to Mexico at the Southerly International Boundary. In accordance with Minute No. 310 and the “The Agreement for Temporary Emergency Delivery of a Portion of the Mexican Treaty Waters of the Colorado River to the International Boundary in the Vicinity of Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico, and for Operation of Facilities in the United States”, up to 1,200 acre-feet per month (1.48 mcm) will be delivered at Tijuana, Baja California.

Calendar year schedules of the monthly deliveries of Colorado River water are formulated by the Mexican Section of the IBWC and presented to the United States Section before the beginning of each calendar year.

~~The International Boundary and Water Commission concluded Minute No. 310 entitled “Emergency Delivery of Colorado River Water for Use in Tijuana, Baja California,” on July 28, 2003. The Minute allows for the delivery of approximately 1,200 acre feet per month of Colorado River water through the California agencies’ distribution system facilities to Tijuana, Baja California. In conformance with the provisions of the Minute, the volume of water delivered and the system conveyance losses will be charged against the total volume of Colorado River water apportioned under the 1944 U.S. Mexico Water Treaty. The Tijuana utility, CESPT, pays all financial costs incurred in making such deliveries. This arrangement will be implemented via an agreement among the Otay Water District, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the San Diego County Water Authority, the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and the Bureau of Reclamation and will be applicable through calendar year 2008.~~

DISCLAIMER

Nothing in this Annual Operating Plan is intended to interpret the provisions of *The Colorado River Compact* (45 Stat. 1057), *The Upper Colorado River Basin Compact* (63 Stat. 31), *The Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande, Treaty Between the United States of America and Mexico* (Treaty Series 994, 59 Stat. 1219), the United States/Mexico agreement in Minute No. 242 of August 30, 1973, (Treaty Series 7708; 24 UST 1968), the Decree entered by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Arizona v. California et al.* (376 U.S. 340), as amended and supplemented, *The Boulder Canyon Project Act* (45 Stat. 1057), *The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act* (54 Stat. 774; 43 U.S.C. 618a), *The Colorado River Storage Project Act* (70 Stat. 105; 43 U.S.C. 620), *The Colorado River Basin Project Act* (82 Stat. 885; 43 U.S.C. 1501), *The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act* (88 Stat. 266; 43 U.S.C. 1951), *The Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984* (98 Stat. 1333), *The Colorado River Floodway Protection Act* (100 Stat. 1129; 43 U.S.C. 1600), or *The Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992* (Title XVIII of Public Law 102-575, 106 Stat. 4669).

Attachment. Monthly inflow, monthly release, and end of month contents for Colorado River reservoirs (October 2003 through September 2005) under the probable maximum, most probable, and the probable minimum inflow scenarios, and historic end of month contents.